SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

12th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XII, No. 11 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | June 15, 1982

Pay and Opportunity Lure NSF Chief to Academe

The relatively low and frozen federal pay scale, plus an opportunity to head an upcoming major university, appear to be the only propellants behind John B. Slaughter's decision to leave the directorship of the National Science Foundation to become Chancellor of the University of Maryland's main campus, at College Park.

Slaughter, a late-term Carter selection who accepted a Reagan invitation to come aboard, is the first black to head the Foundation. He was 18 months into the legislated six-year term when he announced last week that he would be taking the Maryland post January 15.

The NSF Director receives a salary of $60,700 a year, unchanged since Slaughter was sworn in on December 2, 1980. As Chancellor of the College Park campus, he will receive a salary of $75,000, plus an official residence, a car and several other perks. Slaughter, who has a son at veterinary school and a college-bound daughter who finished high school this semester, said he incurred $10,000 in expenses moving to Washington, DC, from Washington State University, where he was Academic Vice President and Provost. Presidential appointees are not reimbursed for such costs; the money came out of family savings, he told SGR in a telephone interview.

Pressures Mount for Creating New Institutes at NIH—Page 7

On the face of it, the Reagan Administration and the NSF Director would seem to have several important opportunities for disharmony, especially since Slaughter frequently expressed an obviously heartfelt determination to encourage women and minorities to pursue careers in science and engineering. When existing NSF programs specifically focused on that goal were reduced or eliminated by the Office of Management and Budget, Slaughter directed the entire Foundation to weave equal-opportunity considerations into all programs.

Slaughter told SGR that the cause he espoused may actually be better served by that Foundation-wide orientation. "NSF," he said, "is now more sensitive to women and minorities, and people are turned on by the problems."

There was often speculation in science-policy circles that Slaughter, serving in an Administration ideologically opposed to the Administration that had originally selected him, must be feeling some discontent. If so, he kept it concealed with nary a slip.

One theory is that NSF has fared relatively well in a difficult financial period, and that the areas where it was most severely slugged, the social sciences and elementary and secondary education programs, really did need an overhaul. OMB, of course, gave it worse than that, cutting out virtually all funding for both. But, in collaboration with the National Science Board, NSF's policymaking body, Slaughter helped establish the NSB Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology (SGR Vol. XII, No. 8). Slaughter has said in several public addresses that he regards the Commission as the most important development in his service as NSF Director. And Congress put back some of the social-science money.

Another theory concerning Slaughter's uncomplaining performance is that political reality provides for no alternative. The Director of NSF serves at the pleasure

(Continued on page 2)

In Brief

A little-publicized new addition to federal law, the Prompt Payments Act, provides relief for government contractors who experience undue delay in getting paid. Signed into law May 21—and effective next Oct. 1—the Act provides that federal agencies must pay their bills within 45 days or pay interest penalties to the contractor at the going Treasury borrowing rate, now 14.75 percent. The law is applicable only to contracts, not to grants.

A study of popular magazines shows a disturbing correlation between the volume of cigarette advertising and articles discussing the health hazards of smoking, according to the American Council on Science and Health—which is generally regarded by public-interest consumer organizations as an industry front. The Council reports, for example, that between 1971-81, Cosmopolitan *took in $5.5 million from cigarette ads, and carried 338 health-related articles; of these, only 2.3 percent dealt with smoking.* Good Housekeeping *took no cigarette ads and devoted 22 percent of its health articles to smoking.*

Anson R. Bertrand, Director of the Department of Agriculture's Science and Education Administration, is moving to the Agency for International Development, where he'll head the Office of Agriculture in the Science and Technology Bureau.

Keyworth Says Politics Won't Figure in NSF Post

Describing NSF Director John B. Slaughter's resignation announcement as "a bombshell that I'm not yet used to," White House Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II told SGR last week that the Administration is seeking a scientifically topflight successor, without regard to political flavor.

His assurance comes at a time of reports of political considerations intruding on science-advisory appointments at the Food and Drug Administration, a recent row over similar allegations at the Department of Agriculture, and a general perception of the Reagan Administration as ideologically tough on appointments that have previously been isolated from political considerations.

Keyworth met on June 7 with Lewis M. Branscomb, Chairman of the National Science Board, and Charles B. Slichter, who chairs the panel NSB created to recommend a successor.

"I told them to stress excellence and not to pay any attention to politics," Keyworth said. In a telephone conversation with SGR, Keyworth added that the Administration is also putting high value on "capacity for imagination and vision" in looking for a successor. And it wants to make the choice quickly so that the appointee can take part in preparations, now getting underway, for the fiscal 1984 budget. With that coming budget cycle in mind, Slaughter has set his departure for January 15.

Keyworth said he doesn't care whether the successor "is young or old, academic or industrial." The quest is for a topflight person, he said, and he predicted that the choice would be of the caliber of James Wyngaarden, whose appointment as Director of the National Institutes of Health has drawn much applause and no quibbles.

"We didn't ask about his politics," Keyworth said of Wyngaarden, who is a registered, but not active, Democrat.

Keyworth also said that he plans to "work together" with the National Science Board in filling the NSF post.

Asked whether he espected the new NSF Director to preside over significant changes in the Foundation's role, Keyworth said he didn't foresee any fundamental changes in NSF's task. "Basic research and the health of the universities will still be paramount." he said.

SLAUGHTER *(Continued from page 1)*

of the President. While academic scientists and administrators attentively follow NSF affairs, the agency ranks relatively low in budget and in political connections in Washington, and, perhaps most important of all, the elders of the Foundation prefer to stay away from politics. When Senator Joe McCarthy was running loose, the Science Board publicly assailed his attempts at intruding on professional judgments at the Foundation. But, since then, the Board has tended to avoid confrontations that might arouse political resentments. The impression one gets is a fear of being trampled.

The selection of a successor for Slaughter is through a process that calls for nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate. The NSF's basic legislative charter provides that the President "shall afford the [National Science] Board an opportunity" to make recommendations. The Board, taking that seriously, has already appointed a panel, chaired by Charles B. Slichter, Professor of Physics, University of Illinois, to make recommendations. (Other members are: Jay Back, Professor emeritus, Brigham Young University; Ernestine Friedl, Professor of Anthropology, Duke University; Walter Messey, Director, Argonne National Laboratory, and Stuart Rice, Professor of Chemistry, University of Illinois.) But there's no requirement for the President to pay attention to the Board's recommendations.

Slaughter told SGR that, on the basis of conversations that he's had, he feels confident that the Administration "wants a person who believes in NSF and who is acceptable to the scientific community."

Some confidence that those criteria will be observed is

(Continued on page 3)

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher **Daniel S. Greenberg**

Associate Publisher **Wanda J. Reif**

Circulation Manager **Diane Kupelian**

Contributing Correspondents

Christopher Joyce, Kim A. McDonald (Washington); Francois Seguier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $127.50 (two years, $220.00); individuals, $55.00 (two years, $95.00). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

National Labs: Groping in the Political Dark

Mandated spending cuts, combined with Washington's long-running budget deadlock and stalled proposals to dismantle the Department of Energy and relocate its research functions in the Department of Commerce, are creating administrative chaos in the DOE-financed network of national laboratories. A hearing before the House Science and Technology Committee on June 2 produced a barrage of exasperated testimony from senior executives of the labs, including the following:

•

Herman Postma, Director, Oak Ridge National Laboratory:

We are in the midst of an even more complicated [planning] process this year. With the large number of committees involved and the increasing gap between the House and the Senate and between the Congress and the Administration, it is more difficult to reconcile or even guess at the differences between Congress' intent and the Administration's intent with respect to such a large number of programs and proposals.

When do we know our budget? We attempt—through informal guidance from the various DOE program offices, hearings and assessment of the mood of Congress—to determine a budget for each of the 1100 projects that make up the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. This must be done continually because the budget is a metamorphic process in contrast with many other government activities. It begins with the time when the President's budget is first introduced and continues through the many Congressional hearings. However, ORNL does not receive official guidance from DOE on the entire budget until the first financial plan is issued about the first day of the fiscal year. And in that DOE, too, must guess because, subsequent to the first financial plan, 15 changes usually take place during the course of the year—with some programs adjusted upward and others downward. In many cases, the budget is only established in a fairly concrete way during the second quarter of the fiscal year when DOE program managers understand what the budget might be for the next year and, consequently, are willing to reach decisions for the present fiscal year.

In summary, generally, we do not have a reasonable understanding of our budget until the fiscal year is half over. Therefore, we must continually assess and judge using the art of verbal communications to determine what our budget will be for as much as a year before we have firm numbers. When it is known that the budget is likely to increase or remain fairly stable, such guesswork is tolerable; for if we underestimate the budget, we are still able to hire, set up contracts, or in some cases even stretch work out over a longer period of time.

However, a new dilemma has arisen in the last two years simply because, as the budget decreased, the degree to which impacts had to be judged became far more critical for several reasons. Not only did the programmatic areas have to be reduced, but the resultant very large impact on people, their futures, and the continuity of their research became paramount considerations. In addition, there is a simple but very complicating administrative fact: If timely actions are not taken, the problem is exacerbated. For example, if a budget would support say 100 people through a given fiscal year and it is anticipated that in the next fiscal year the budget would support only 90 people, then if we delay too long in acting on the surplus ten people, the number becomes greater than ten because salaries, severance pay, etc., would have decreased the available funds. As the fiscal year progresses, the number becomes even greater so that early action which might affect ten people could later, if delayed, affect as many as 20. Thus, guessing at what the budgets will be and

(Continued on page 4)

SLAUGHTER *(Continued from page 2)*

derived from Mr. Reagan's recently sworn-in choice to head the National Institutes of Health, James Wyngaarden, a widely respected, establishment-approved medical researcher and educator.

That choice is seen by some observers as evidence that the Administration won't let its resident nuts loose on appointments for highly demanding scientific and technical jobs where an ideological rumpus could do serious damage.

There's a difference, though: The NIH directorship does have the guardianship of Secretary of Health and Human Services Richard S. Schweiker, who has tended to be sensitive to mainstream institutional concerns in dealings with Bethesda. NSF, on the other hand, is a free-standing agency, reporting directly to the White House, and, in recent years, the target of a variety of kook potshots.—DSG

Science Board Re-Elects Branscomb

Lewis M. Branscomb, Vice President and Chief Scientist of IBM, has been elected to a second two-year term as Chairman of the National Science Board, the senior policymaking body of the National Science Foundation. At the same election, held May 20, Mary L. Good, Vice President and Director of Research at UOP, Inc., was elected Vice Chairman of the Board.

...The Woes of Planning at Brookhaven Lab

(Continued from page 3)
then acting in a timely manner to prevent even more serious impacts to programs and people is the dilemma that confronts us....

Martin Blume, Associate Director, Brookhaven National Laboratory:

The Laboratory has an intensive program underway to develop a new form of cable for the underground transmission of large amounts of electrical power... After more than ten years of work and expenditure of over $20 million, we have the major elements of a practical cable system in hand, completed a 100-meter long test facility, and we are now beginning the period of testing and demonstration of the cable.

The Presidential budget submitted last year for FY 1982 eliminated the project, but Congress restored the funding. Once again, the FY 1983 funding for the Superconducting Power Transmission Line project is zero, reflecting the phase-out of the DOE Electric Energy program. An abrupt close-down in FY 1983 will leave much engineering evaluation data concerning the performance of the superconducting power transmission test facility still to be obtained. This is a unique facility which only came on-line in FY 1982. A revised request for $2,000,000 has been submitted, which would permit the full benefit to be reaped for the large development effort involved in building this facility. The revised request will allow the facility to be operated for about 25 weeks, during which time performance characteristics will be evaluated, and the project can be brought to an orderly conclusion.

In other applied programs such as Energy Storage Systems, Solar Energy Conservation and Fossil Energy, the uncertainties as to whether or not Congress will restore funding or adopt the Administration's plan to close out these programs relegates our planning function to a guessing game.

Do we close out the projects, destroy the research progress already made and make difficult or impossible reaction to a restoration of funding by Congress, or do we continue a strong scientific program and risk exhausting our funding and facing unbudgeted termination costs? These are some of the problems management faces. In previous years, the answers were more predictable, as we were able to read the signs and had guidance from the Administration. Today, we guess and try to develop alternate plans in case we guess wrong....

In Print

World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers—1970-79, 13th and latest in an annual series produced by the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The text includes Reagan Administration policy statements on arms sales, and tables provide details on the nations that are selling and buying in the $500-billion-a-year arms trade; 134 pages, single copies available without charge from Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Defense Program and Analysis Division, Washington, DC 20451, Attn: Daniel Gallik; tel. (202) 632-0816.

Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering, a report of the National Science Foundation, notes a 32-percent increase in employment of female scientists and engineers from 1974 to 1978, but female representation in those professions was still less than 10 percent; racial minorities also experienced a big percentage jump but by 1978, constituted only 4 percent of the scientist-engineer workforce. The report, 124 pages, contains scores of tables and charts; single copies available without charge from National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Studies, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550.

The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment has issued four new publications in its series on the *Implications of Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Medical Technology;* all are available from the Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402:

"Four Common X-ray Procedures: Problems and Prospects for Economic Evaluation," 052-003-00872-6, $4.50.

"Cost Benefit/Cost Effectiveness of Medical Technologies: A Case Study of Orthopedic Joint Implants," 052-003-00850-5, $2.25.

"The Costs and Effectiveness of Nurse Practitioners," 052-003-00844-1, $3.00.

"Surgery for Breast Cancer," 052-003-00857-2, $2.50.

Last March's joint Senate-House hearings on earthquake research and hazard reduction have been published and are available without charge. To order, specify *Reauthorization of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act,* No. 76, and send a self-addressed label to Publications Office, Committee on Science and Technology, H2-155, Annex 2, 3d and D Sts. SW, Washington, DC 20515; tel. (202) 225-6275.

White House to the Aid of Monkey Importers

Is the government of Bangladesh impeding the supply of polio vaccine for American babies?

An influential slice of official Washington apparently thinks so, including George A. Keyworth II, Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). Keyworth, along with the State Department and Senators Robert Packwood (R-Oregon) and Howard Baker (R-Tenn.), has joined a three-year-old effort to pressure Bangladesh into lifting its ban on the commercial export of indigenous rhesus monkeys, the species of primate used in the producton and safety testing of polio vaccine in the US.

In 1976, an enterprising trio from Portland, Oregon, formed a company for the sole purpose of importing rhesus monkeys and gibbon apes from Bangladesh into the US for use in biomedical research. Within months, the company, known as MOL Enterprises, had secured an exclusive contract with the government of Bangladesh to act as broker in the sale to the US of approximately 77,000 rhesus monkeys (as well as an unspecified number of hoolock gibbons) over a period of ten years.

However, in January 1979, a mere two years and 1600 monkeys after the contract went into effect, Bangladesh cut off the supply, citing as reasons for its action the failure of MOL to build a breeding farm, as specified in the contract, and, also contrary to the terms of the contract, the sale of several monkeys to a US government lab engaged in research for the military on the behavioral effects of neutron bomb radiation.

MOL was understandably distressed at the prospect of losing its $1.5-million investment in the deal, not to mention the profit it had expected to turn by purchasing the monkeys from Bangladesh for $81.50 each and selling them on the US market for anywhere between $350 and $1000. Less understandable is the ongoing involvement of high government officials in a straight commercial dispute, involvement that has ranged in intensity from letters to Bangladesh about the inadvisability of alienating American business to a warning that Bangladesh could lose its foreign aid if it did not resume the export of monkeys to the US through MOL.

At first blush, any amount of muscle the US could use on Bangladesh would seem justifiable, indeed desirable, if the claims being made by MOL (and echoed by OSTP, State and Packwood and Baker) that vital medical research is being hampered by a shortage of rhesus monkeys were true. A bit of investigation, of the claims, however, invites doubt.

Joe Held, Director of the Office of Research Resources at the National Institutes of Health and Chairman of the Interagency Primate Steering Committee, which sets the policy for primate research in the US, has stated that the combined success of domestic breeding and recycling of rhesus monkeys and the replacement of rhesus in several major areas of research with their cheaper, more abundant cousin, the crab-eating macaque, have staved off the threat of a shortage which seemed imminent in 1978. Nor is there any reason to exploit the wild populations of rhesus in Bangladesh for the production and testing of polio vaccine. According to Paul Stessel of Lederle Laboratories, the major manufacturer of the vaccine, the company has an adequate supply of monkeys from domestic sources and expects to be self-sustaining from its own breeding colony in Texas in 5-10 years.

Why, then, is the government leaning on Bangladesh?

Jack Faust, MOL's legal counsel, is candid about his good political connections on Capitol Hill. Twice Packwood's campaign manager, Faust promptly enlisted the Senator's support for MOL. Faust says he learned from officials in the Bangladesh government that they decided the contract had been broken following allegations against MOL's performance by the International Primate Protection League. The League is a coalition of conservationists and field and laboratory primatologists whose co-Chairwoman, Shirley McGreal, has been called "a rabid anti-vivisectionist" by William Walsh, the State Department's coordinator of international biomedical research; she's also been called the leader of "a bunch of crazies" by a Keyworth aide who prefers to remain nameless. Faust says Bangladesh had no grounds for a contractual dispute and knew it had none. Which is just what Packwood, and later, Baker, told the Bangladesh government. Never mind that no one on either of the senators' staffs ever bothered to read the original contract. The contract seemed to have escaped the scrutiny of the State Department, as well.

Not until he received word from the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), was State's William Walsh, author of numerous memos to the American embassy in Bangladesh about the "rhesus monkey impasse," aware thata the provision in the MOL contract dealing with the capture and export of hoolock gibbons, an endangered species, was illegal.

This was the second time Walsh had been caught up short in this monkey business. In 1978, he assured India, which had just imposed a ban on the export of its rhesus monkeys to the US, that the animals were only for breeding and polio vaccine production and testing; at the time, however, MOL was selling rhesus monkeys from Bangladesh to the Department of Defense's Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute, where

(Continued on page 6)

Grant Swinger: Tips on Academic Protocol

The following excerpts, from The Grant Swinger Manual of Academic Protocol, *provide descriptions of typical academic situations and the responses recommended by Dr. Swinger, Director of the Center for the Absorption of Federal Funds.*

●

SITUATION. You receive an invitation to present a paper, but no mention is made of an honorarium. Delicacy, however, forbids a direct inquiry.

RESPONSE. Send a letter expressing gratitude for the invitation. Add that you are trying to determine whether your schedule permits you to make a commitment. In the meantime, "for recordkeeping purposes and to conform with conflict-of-interest guidelines, it would be helpful to be advised as to the financial arrangements."

SITUATION. Having accepted the invitation, but having done little or no preparation, you are unable to honor the program chairman's request that papers be submitted beforehand for distribution to the participants.

RESPONSE. Open with remarks as follows, preferably in a modest mumble: "I fully realize that the organization of this program calls for a formal presentation, but in the interest of rapport and the free flow of ideas, I think it might perhaps be desirable for me to state a few points and then, perhaps, we can move on to a discussion in which we can pursue promising lines of interest. Since all of us, myself, perhaps, most of all, are here to learn, I believe that this might be a more fruitful approach. So, with the permission and understanding of the chairman..." (who, of course, is helpless). At this point, for protective purposes, it may be advisable to add: "First, so that we can focus as quickly as possible on what, after all, is an elusive subject, let me briefly delineate what it is I am *not* attempting to discuss."

SITUATION. A member of the audience, obviously well prepared, delivers a damaging critique of your remarks.

RESPONSE. "I think Dr. _____ has sliced directly to the heart of the matter, and, incidentally, has vindicated my belief that we would cover more ground if we did not confine ourselves to a rigid programmatic framework. Nevertheless, and I hope we will have some comments on this, I don't think our analyses are mutually exclusive. In fact, my initial reaction is to regard them as perhaps complementing one another."

SITUATION. Inquiry is made concerning your frequent absences from your regular place of employment.

RESPONSE. Jocularly observe that (choose one: Fermi, Oppenheimer, Einstein, Edison—almost any Hall of Fame figure will do) once said, "A great scientist can never be found in his own lab, but a truly great scientist can't even be found in a lab that he's visiting."

SITUATION. Inquiry is made as to your limited, perhaps nonexistent, research output.

RESPONSE. "As _____ (select name as above) once said, 'A good scientist has a good idea once a year, a great one every decade, but a truly great one,

(Continued on page 7)

MONKEYS *(Continued from page 5)*

they were to serve as stand-ins for human beings irradiated by a neutron bomb explosion. Apparently, this was not what Bangladesh had in mind when it agreed to the wording in the contract with MOL, which stated that rhesus monkeys "shall be used exclusively for the purpose of medical and other scientific research...generally understood to include physiology and immunology, infectious diseases, cancer, metabolic disorders, cardiovascular and pulmonary disease, alcoholism, drug abuse, behavior, testing of biologics, production and testing of vaccines."

No one is saying how Keyworth got into the fray, but his nameless aide did offer a why: Keyworth met last March with Bangladesh Ambassador Tabarak Husain in order to "protect a commercial transaction" that was not getting resolved despite "a good deal of senatorial pressure." The OSTP source continued: Keyworth soothed Husain by telling him that the International Primate Protection League, which has field representatives in 21 countries, was "a fringe organization...extremely clever at mixing truth with half-truth." He also told Husain, who delicately reminded him of Bangladesh's support of nuclear-nonproliferation, that no Bangladesh monkey "would ever be used in the development of any nuclear weapons." However, he continued, this did not preclude the possibility of "small numbers" of monkeys being "allowed to be irradiated for the advancement of medical knowledge in fields like cancer research."

MOL, meanwhile, has begun to take a conciliatory attitude toward Bangladesh, upping its offer to $150 per monkey, dropping the idea of trafficking in endangered gibbons, and suggesting that an impartial observer assess the biological status of the rhesus population before export resumes.—Nancy Heneson

The author is a free-lance specializing in science and medical subjects.

Disease Lobbies Seek Own NIH Institutes

The so-called disease-of-the-month clubs are busily working Capitol Hill in behalf of their longtime goals: new institutes or the split-up of existing ones at the National Institutes of Health.

The current drive, according to John A. D. Cooper, President of the Association of American Medical Colleges (which likes NIH as it is), is so intense, that "In an almost desperation-induced attempt to stem the epidemic of proposals," he recently wrote to his members, he assembled a kind of summit of biomedical politicians. Attending were Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health and Environment; several staff aides of other key members, and James Wyngaarden, the newly installed NIH Director, and several members of his staff.

Under discussion was a proposal by Rep. Ron Wyden (D-Oregon) to establish an arthritis institute, which has already been approved by the Energy and Commerce Committee, and a diabetes institute proposed by Rep. Thomas A. Luken (D-Ohio); also in the hopper are proposals for institutes for pulmonary, digestive, communicative and otolaryngological diseases.

Cooper reported that "Wyngaarden presented a well-reasoned argument for preservation of the integrity of the NIH." He was followed by Les Salans, the Acting Director of the National Institute of Arthritis, Diabetes, and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, who, according to Cooper, "explained in great detail all the actions that the institute had taken in the last year to satisfy the needs and demands of the groups seeking autonomous status for their special interests."

The strategy of choice for dealing with the expansionist movements is to resist as long as possible and then buy them off with nomenclature changes. For example, just last year, the above-mentioned institute was merely the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases. When the pressure built up "Metabolism"— for which there is no lobby—was jettisoned and "Diabetes" and "Kidney" were added.

The difficulty with the strategy, however, is that once established inside an existing institute, the lobbyists regroup and set off after their primary goal: an institute of their own, as is now being sought for several medical disorders.

SWINGER *(Continued from page 6)*

only once in a lifetime.' Now, I'm not so foolish as to suggest..."

SITUATION. You fear the results if a book you have written is assigned to certain reviewers.

RESPONSE. Mention them admiringly in the acknowledgements, even if only on the basis of reference to their published works, and make certain their names are included in the index. Review editors will assume they are friendly associates and will therefore consider them ineligible on grounds of partisanship.

SITUATION. As occasionally happens through the peculiarities of academic finance, you unexpectedly acquire control over a substantial sum of money, but can conceive of no useful way in which it might be spent.

RESPONSE. Convene a symposium. Solicit expressions of interest for attending, then seek to enlarge the sum by applying for foundation assistance.

SITUATION. A committee that you chair meets at great length and accomplishes nothing. Influential members appear annoyed.

RESPONSE. Conclude the meeting as follows: "I think we've cleared away a good deal of the underbrush, and from here on we can devote ourselves more closely to examining some constructive alternatives. For this purpose, I would like to ask certain members to draw up a few specific proposals that we can toss around at the next session."

SITUATION. Students show hostility because of your good relations with the administration.

RESPONSE. Depict yourself as one who has miraculously managed to maintain communication with the administration, despite your sympathy for the students.

SITUATION. The administration shows hostility because of your good relations with the students.

RESPONSE. Depict yourself as one who has miraculously managed to maintain communications with the students, despite your sympathy for the administration.

(From The Grant Swinger Papers, *by Daniel S. Greenberg, 32 pages, $4.95 per copy, postpaid; Science & Government Report, PO Box 6226, Washington, DC, 20015. Please send payment with order.)*

USGS Names Chief Geologist

Robert M. Hamilton has been named Chief Geologist of the US Geological Survey, succeeding Dallas L. Peck, who was appointed Director of the USGS last July.

$15 Million Awarded for Environmental Center

The bountiful MacArthur Foundation has put up $15 million—biggest bundle of its kind, it says—to establish a non-profit Institute for World Environment and Resources "for policy research and analysis addressed to global resources and environmental issues."

To be located in Washington, the Institute is laden with many Carter-era environmentalists who are profoundly in opposition to the Reagan-Watt-Gorsuch evisceration of environmental gains of recent years.

Gustave Speth, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality under Carter, will be President of the Institute. Matthew Nimetz, who served with the Carter Administration as Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, will be chairman of the Board, and John E. Cantlon, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, Michigan State University, will be Vice Chairman.

Serving as Vice President and Research Director will be Jessica Tuchman Mathews, a *Washington Post* editorial writer who was a senior member of the National Security Council Staff under Carter; Wallace Bowman, who was Executive Director of the National Academy of Sciences Commission on Natural Resources, will be Vice President for Operations and Development.

An announcement from the MacArthur Foundation says the Institute will be interdisciplinary, will establish working relations with other institutions, and will cover a wide range of issues, including: fresh water resources, agricultural lands and desertification, genetic diversity and species conservation, fisheries and ocean resources, inadvertent climate modification, energy resources and non-fuel minerals, transboundary pollution problems, and forest management.

Listed as having expressed interest in working with the Institute are the Energy and Resources Group, University of California; the Center for Energy and Environmental Studies, Princeton University, and the Ecosystems Center, Woods Hole Marine Biological Laboratory.

The announcement added that "The Institute will have a core staff, a shorter-term project staff consisting of project directors and associates working on specific studies to develop and analyze alternative policy options and a fellowship program to attract to the Institute creative and energetic thinkers."

The Institute expects to be fully operational in about two years and to operate on an annual budget of $4 million. The MacArthur Foundation, headquartered in Chicago, said the $15-million grant "is to help finance the first five years" of the Institute.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.